



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

es einfach den gotischen Vokalismus für die anderen germanischen Sprachen vorauszusetzen. In ags. *tréow* und alts. *trēuwa* liegen jüngere Entwicklungen des westg. *iu* vor.

Altn. *tryggr* beweist also nichts für altes **e + ww*, sondern stützt im Gegenteil die got. und ahd. Formen, welche auf altes **i + ww* zurückgehen. Man wird hier sagen müssen, dass das Problem am verkehrten Ende angefasst wird, wenn man die älteren Formen als Abweichung von den jüngeren ansieht, und z. B. mit Sievers und mit Falk u. Torp (Germanischer Sprachschatz, Bd. III, S. 171; Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, S. 1290) got. *triggws* und altn. *tryggr* auf eine Grundform **trewwi* zurückführt. Eine Grundform **tri + ww + a* erklärt das Altn. ohne Annahme einer Suffixendung auf *j*. Bei einer Grundform **trewwi* muss man zunächst *tryggr* als *(w)ja-*, *(w)jô-* Stamm erklären, der in die Flexion der reinen *wa-*, *wô-* Stämme übergetreten sei. Warum einen solchen Umweg machen, da das *i* der Stammsilbe sich ganz gut mit dem Vokal der Endung verträgt: Urg. **tri + ww + az* > Urn. **tri + ggv + aR* > Altn. *tryggr*? Das *j* Suffix des Westg. (Ahd. *ga-triuw-i*, Alts. *ge-triuwi*, Ags. *getrēwe*) hat nichts mit dem Nordischen zu tun, sondern beruht ausschliesslich auf westg. Eigenheiten, indem das *uw*, *uj*. u. s. w. des Westg. wie ein alter *u* Stamm behandelt und *triuw-* demgemäss in die *ja-*, *jô-* Declination der Adjectiva übergeführt ist.

Ferner sollte es bei Falk und Torp (Germanischer Sprachschatz, S. 171) statt Alts. *triwi*, *trēwa* heissen *triuwi* oder (*triuui*), *trēuwa* oder (*trēuua*), denn die Stammsilbe ist im Heliand nach Ausweis des Metrums stets lang, hat also Diphthong.

Beim altn. Personalpronomen *yðr* sieht man gleichfalls, dass sich das altn. *i* mit einem *a* Stamme ganz gut verträgt, wenn man nämlich das Possessivum *yðarr* hinzunimmt. Hier herrschen wesentlich dieselben Vokalverhältnisse wie bei *tryggr*, denn das Got., das Altn., und das Ahd. bewahren alle das alte *i*. Nur im Ags. und im Alts. (also im Ingaevonischen) zeigt das *i* Neigung in *e* überzugehen: beim Pronomen Got. *izwis*, Altn. *yðr*, Alth. *iu*, aber Ags. *éow* (*íow*), Alts. *eu*, *iu(u)*; beim Possessivum

Got. *izwar*, Altn. *yðarr*, Althd. *iuwêr*, aber Ags. *éower* (*íower*), Alts. *euwa*, (*iuwa*). Nach der herkömmlichen Ansicht über altes *e* würde man auch hier gezwungen sein, am verkehrten Ende anzufangen, um zu beweisen, dass das Ingaevonische den älteren urgermanischen Vokal vertritt.

Bei altn. *tryggr* und *yðr* ist die Annahme des Grundvokals *i* insoweit begründet, als das *y* nichts für altes *e* beweist, sondern im Gegenteil zeigt, dass ein *i* im Altn. sich mit dem *a* der Endung vertragen kann, und als dieses *i* auch an dem Vokalismus des Got. (*triggws*) und des Ahd. (*triuwa*) eine Stütze findet. Vom geschichtlichen Standpunkte aus betrachtet, wäre es verkehrt, die urg. Grundform nach jüngeren Spracheigenheiten aufzustellen, welche offenbar mit älteren Erscheinungen im Widerspruch stehen. Meine Untersuchungen über das altn. *tryggr*, (zu denen ich durch Prof. Collitz's Aufsatz über "*Segimer*" und persönliche Förderung seinerseits angeregt bin) haben dazu gedient, mich in der Überzeugung der Richtigkeit seiner Verneinung des alten germanischen *e* zu bekräftigen. Es lohnte sich wohl, auch andere Fälle, in denen ein westg. *iu* = altn. *y* + Konsonant (wie oben in *tryggr*, *yðr*) vorliegt, über das Gesamtgebiet des Germanischen zu verfolgen.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *THE LATE LANCASHIRE WITCHES*

Fleay is undoubtedly correct in his statement that this is an old play of Heywood's, revised by Brome to make it timely in its contemporary allusions, for a revival in 1634.¹ Fleay, however, has not given a very accurate determination of the parts attributable to the two authors.

The evidence which indicates that the play

¹ Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*, 1, 301.

is a revision is in the obvious interpolation of an episode, an omission of one or two incidents that we are led to expect, and a mention in two places of names of witches or spirits inconsistent with the names in the rest of the play. A transaction between Generous and Arthur, involving a mortgage, is mentioned in Act I (p. 178),² and Robin, in Act III (p. 210), gives his master Generous a receipt for one hundred pounds, which he has dropped. These two incidents seem to be connected, but not very clearly. They also ought to lead up to something, but they are hardly mentioned further. Again, in Act II (p. 197), Arthur and Shakstone bet on the speed of their dogs in chasing a hare, but the scene ends abruptly on p. 199, without the interference of witchcraft which we are led to expect. These scenes indicate that something has been omitted in the present version of the play. Moreover, the incident of the boy and the gray hounds (pp. 196, 199-201) is obviously an interpolation with no connection with any of the threads of interest. The boy is brought in again in Act V (p. 241 ff.) as a witness against the witches, but his evidence is quite unnecessary, for the *dénouement* is brought about by the soldier who sleeps in the mill. The final indication of revision is the speech of Mrs. Generous in Act IV (p. 240):

"Call Meg, and Doll, Tib, Nab, and Iug,"

and the use of three of these names, Nab, Iug, and Peg, again in Act V (p. 244). The names of the witches throughout the rest of the play are Maud (Hargrave), Meg (Johnson), Gil (Goody Dickison), Mall (Spenser), and Nan Generous; while the familiars are Suckling, Pug, and Mamilion.³

The play, then, as published in 1634, is a revision. We may dispose of the possibility of collaboration in the revision by the fact that Heywood was writing for the Queen's Company in 1633 and that the *Lancashire Witches*⁴ was brought out by the King's Men, the com-

pany for which Brome was writing in 1633 and 1634.

We are able to determine, to a certain extent, the parts that may be ascribed to each author by comparing the play with the three sources that have been discovered. The main plot, the story of a woman of wealth practicing witchcraft, finally discovered and condemned, is taken from a celebrated witch-trial in Lancashire in 1612. As ten witches were condemned and executed as the result of the trial, considerable notoriety was given to it. Heywood, with a journalist's instinct, made a play on the subject probably within a year of the trial.⁵ Besides this indication of Heywood's authorship of the main plot, the treatment of the erring wife by her husband (Act IV, p. 228) strongly suggests the *Woman Killed with Kindness*.

Closely connected with the main plot are three characters, Arthur, Shakstone, and Bantam⁶ who, in the first scene of the play, accuse Whetstone, a foolish fellow, of being a bastard. At the end of the fourth act, Whetstone has his revenge by showing, with the aid of witchcraft, visions of the fathers of the three gallants—a pedant, a tailor, and a serving man. Since this incident, as Langbaine pointed out, occurs in Heywood's *Hierarchy of Angels*,⁷ which was not published until 1635, and was, therefore, probably not known to Brome at the time of his revision, I assign the parts in which these characters occur to Heywood.

Another interest in the play is the comic situation brought about by the reversal of the relations of father and son, mother and daughter, and servant and master, as an effect of witchcraft.⁸ This part of the play, which includes the characters of Old Seely, his son Gregory, and a friend, Doughty, I can find no good reason for attributing to Brome. On the other hand, as this reversed situation has some bearing on the relation of Arthur and Generous

⁵ T. Potts's *Discoverie of Witches in the County of Lancaster*, London, 1613 (Reprinted by the Chetham Society, 1845), gives a full account of the trial, but I do not think it was the actual source of the play. Heywood probably had merely heard of the trial.

⁶ See pp. 176, 189 ff., 246 ff., 250 ff.

⁷ Bk. 8, p. 512.

⁸ Pp. 179-187.

¹ Heywood's *Works*, 1873, Vol. iv.

² See pp. 187-189, 199-202, 218-222, 235.

³ See title page to a *Maiden-head well Lost*, 1634, and Schelling's *List, Eliz. Drama*, 2, 586.

(pp. 178 and 182) in the main plot, it seems to me it must be assigned to Heywood.

The greater part of the rest of the play is taken up with the strange events at the marriage of Lawrence and Parnell, the servants of the Seely family. The witches play all sorts of pranks with the wedding feast and frighten the guests; and one of them, Mall Spenser, gives Lawrence a bewitched cod-piece point, which causes a great deal of vulgar comedy by preventing him from consummating his marriage. This plot is involved to such an extent with all the different interests I have mentioned before, that I cannot see any possibility of a separate authorship for it. Arthur, Bantam, Shakstone, Whetstone, Seely, Doughty, and Gregory—characters in the other plots—are present in some capacity, chiefly in the wedding scenes; Mall Spenser, who gives Lawrence the fatal present, has an intrigue with Robin, the servant who plays such an important part in the Nan Generous plot. Furthermore, there is a piece of external evidence, which, I think, indicates that the Lawrence-Parnell plot was in the early version of the play. In Field's *Woman is a Weathercock* (v. 1), one character addressing another as a very lusty person says, "O thou beyond Lawrence of Lancashire." As Field's play was entered in the Stationers' Register Nov. 23, 1611, and the trial in Lancashire, from which Heywood drew his play, was not over until Aug., 1612, Field cannot be referring to Heywood's Lawrence. However, the probability is that both dramatists are using the name of a real character well-known to the audience, or a proverbial name for a person of his type. Whichever be the case, I think it safer to infer that the allusions to Lawrence should be dated as close together as possible. An allusion of this sort twenty years old would probably be forgot. Therefore, this external evidence also points to 1613 as the date of composition of the Lawrence-Parnell plot. Fleay seems to imply that the part of Lawrence and Parnell was added by Brome, because he says that the dialect which they speak is that of the *Northern Lass*.⁹

⁹ Fleay, *op. cit.*, 1, 303.

This, however, is not true. The speech of Lawrence and Parnell, which is considered fairly good Lancashire dialect,¹⁰ is much more difficult for the average reader than that of Constance in the *Northern Lass*, who speaks a sort of general North English dialect.¹¹ As Heywood also had used a northern dialect elsewhere—*e. g.*, in *Edward IV*—as well as Brome, Fleay's argument is useless.

This attribution leaves very little part in the play to Brome. I think that all that can be shown positively to be his work are the passages that are undoubtedly based on the evidence gathered at the second trial for witchcraft in Lancashire in 1633. These are the short scene of the boy and the grayhounds in Act II (pp. 196–197); the sequel to it, in which one of the grayhounds turns into Goody Dickison (pp. 199–201); the scene of the meeting of the witches (pp. 218–221);¹² and the boy's report of his adventure, at the beginning of Act V (pp. 241–244). This assigns to Brome about nine pages in all, out of a play of eighty-nine. Besides this, Brome changed the names of the witches and spirits throughout the play, and probably altered slightly the riming scene in Act IV (p. 235), to introduce the references to Meg, Mamilion, Dickison, Hargrave, and All-Saints' night. He also must have added the prologue and epilogue, and probably the song for Act II, appended to the play.

All these details of the play, just enumerated, were drawn from the *Examination of Edmund Robinson* and the *Confession of Margaret Johnson*.¹³ They must, therefore, because of their later date, have been the additions of Brome.

These interpolations have nothing to do with

¹⁰ Crossley's Intro., *op. cit.*, p. 65, n. 1.

¹¹ Compare the words listed from the two plays by Eckhardt in *Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas*, 1900, 1. 86 and 87.

¹² The original idea of this scene was probably in the first version, but the getting a feast by pulling at ropes and the presence of the boy come from the 1633 version.

¹³ Both found in Crossley's introduction to T. Potts, *op. cit.*, pp. 59–76.

the rest of the play. In fact, Brome's reworking here has resulted in making a worse play out of a very poor one, merely to be up-to-date.

C. E. ANDREWS.

Amherst, Mass.

HONORÉ D'URFÉ'S *SIREINE* AND THE *DIANA* OF MONTEMAYOR

The close relations between Urfé's minor pastoral poem, *Sireine*, and Montemayor's *Diana* have often been briefly referred to by literary critics.¹ But it is only recently, in M.O.-C. Reure's excellent book *La vie et les œuvres de Honoré d'Urfé* (Paris, Plon, 1910), that this interesting question has been studied more in detail. There are, however, a few important facts which M. Reure does not mention. The present paper proposes therefore to compare the French and the Spanish pastoral once more, even at the risk of making, in parts, *double emploi* with M. Reure.

It appears from the manuscript preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Fr. 12486), that the *Sireine* was composed from 1596-1599, some time before the first part of the *Astrée* assumed its definite shape. The author chose for his poem a peculiar stanzaic form of six octosyllabics:

Je chante un despart amoureux,
Un exil long & malheureux,
Et le retour plein de martire.
Amour qui seul en fus l'auteur,
Laisse pour quelque temps mon cœur
Et viens sur ma langue les dire.²

¹ See esp.: Bonafous, *Étude sur l'Astrée et sur H. d'Urfé*, Paris, 1846, pp. 34 and 133 ff.; H. Koerting, *Geschichte d. frz. Romans im 17. Jhdt.*, Leipzig, 1891, vol. I, p. 79; A. Lefranc, "Le roman français au XVIIe siècle" (*Revue des cours et des conférences*, Vol. XIII, 1905, p. 27). The oldest authority is probably Daniel Huet, who declares in his *Traité de l'origine des romans* (1670-72) that "Urfé a pris, . . . comme tant d'autres choses, et l'argument mesme de son Sireine de la Diana de Montemayor."

² Thus in the edition of Paris, 1618, which we follow in our quotations.

As indicated in this first stanza, the poem is divided into three parts, *le despart*, *l'absence* and *le retour de Sireine*. In the manuscript, these parts are of approximately equal length. In subsequent printed editions, however, the poem was greatly enlarged, especially the third part, which was increased to more than double its original length.³

The argument in short is as follows: Sireine, a shepherd of the kingdom of Leon in Spain, and Diane, a shepherdess, have sworn eternal fidelity to one another. But Sireine is sent away by his master, on the banks of the river Eridan. During his absence, he receives a letter from Diane, urging him to return: her mother wants her to marry Delio, a rich but uncouth shepherd. Sireine returns, but arrives too late; on the very ship that brings him home he hears that Diane, still loving only him, has fulfilled her duty as a daughter and married Delio whom she does not love. Upon his arrival Sireine meets Silvan, his friend and former rival for Diane's affection, who delivers to him a melancholy love-letter written by Diana with her own blood a few days before the marriage. At the same moment three beautiful nymphs draw near, Doride, Cynthia and Polydore, and Sireine learns from their conversation that Diane has not changed her feeling toward him, but is afraid to show her love, lest she forfeit her good name. This knowledge affords a little comfort to the unfortunate shepherd, and in the concluding stanza the author curses those who cruelly separated Sireine and Diane.

Everybody familiar with Montemayor's *Diana* will at once recognize the great similarity of our plot with the *argumento* of the Spanish novel: Montemayor resumes briefly Diana's love for Sireno, her dislike for Silvano and her final marriage with Delio, "after time and her heart had changed." He concludes: "De

³ The exact figures are:

	manuscr.	ed. of 1606	ed. of 1618
Despart.....	139 stanzas	148	149
Absence.....	122	169	170
Retour.....	142	284	284
Total.....	403	601	603